



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS FOR AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT BUREAUS

By HENRY G. HODGES,

Harrison Fellow in Political Science, University of Pennsylvania.

Recognizing one of the purposes of government to be the supplying of such information to its citizens as will promote their welfare, Governor Glynn of New York, in his message of March 6, 1914, emphasizes the state's duty to provide a system of labor exchanges. He concludes that "there is no information more vital to the citizen of the state than knowledge of where he may obtain work to feed and clothe himself and his dependents." In its first annual report the United States Industrial Commission points to *unemployment* as one of the principal causes of industrial unrest.¹ The same report reiterates advice received from various states to the effect that the condition of unemployment is nationwide. The striking fact is that the issue is more acute on the Pacific coast than in the older sections of the East. This distress is caused largely by an antiquated system of labor marketing. The present system, in most cases, is adaptable to conditions that existed when the United States was east of the Alleghenies. There have recently developed hopeful signs of the abandonment of the old labor peddling system.

The two objects the legislators have in mind in establishing state free employment bureaus are: *first*, to regulate private agencies through competition; *secondly*, to fulfill the state's duty in bringing together the man and the job.² The purpose of the state agency is to care for the *reserve* labor; to keep that reserve as low as possible by a coöperating system of labor exchanges. The efficient reserve for the United States is not gauged by the sum of the reserves necessary for its many thousands of factories. A more intensive shifting of the shiftable labor must be accomplished.

¹ *First Annual Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations.* Washington, D. C., 1914, p. 21.

² For an extended account of the objects of the state employment bureaus, see *United States Labor Bulletin* No. 109, p. 35.

Nineteen states have passed laws providing for more or less effective systems of free employment offices. A bill with a similar purpose has been reported favorably (March 30th) to the legislature of California, by the committee to which it was referred. A bill was presented to the Pennsylvania legislature, providing for a system of public employment offices in the state, on April 7, 1915. Three of the nineteen established bureaus, *viz.*, Nebraska, Maryland and South Dakota, are inactive; two more, Kansas and West Virginia, are operating in a very limited manner.

Municipal bureaus are operated independently in seven states, as follows:

State	Bureaus	Established
Arizona	Phoenix	1914
California	Los Angeles	1893
	Sacramento	1902
Missouri	Kansas City	1912
Montana	Butte	1902
	Great Falls	1905
New Jersey	Newark	1909
New York	New York	1896*
Ohio	Cleveland	1913*
Oregon	Portland	1912
Washington	Seattle	1894
	Tacoma	1904
	Spokane	1905
	Everett	1909

* Abandoned.

Late in 1914 the Bureau of Immigration of the United States Department of Labor began the establishment of thirty-eight branch offices throughout the country, as indicated by Table I. These offices were established primarily for the distribution of farm labor.

"The entire country has been divided into eighteen distribution zones, and the distribution of labor in each zone will be in charge of an officer of the immigration service at the headquarters of each zone. It is hoped to have this plan in operation throughout the country within the next few months."³

³ Extract from a letter from the United States Department of Labor, dated December 3, 1914.

TABLE I *

ZONES FOR DISTRIBUTION OFFICES

September 1, 1914

Zone No.	Headquarters	Territory	Sub-branches
1.	Boston, Mass.	Mass., R. I., Maine	Providence, Portland
2.	New York City	N. Y., N. J., N. H., Vt. Conn.	Buffalo
3.	Philadelphia	Pa., Del., W. Va.	Pittsburgh
4.	Baltimore, Md.	Maryland	
5.	Norfolk, Va.	Va., N. Car.	
6.	Jacksonville, Fla.	Fla., Geo., Ala., S. Car.	{ Birmingham, Charles- ton, Savannah, Mobile
7.	New Orleans, La.	La., Miss., Ark., Tenn.	{ Gulfport, Miss. Memphis, Tenn.
8.	Galveston, Tex.	Texas, N. Mex.	Albuquerque
9.	Cleveland, Ohio	Ohio, Kentucky	
10.	Chicago, Ill.	Ill., Ind., Mich., Wis.	Detroit
11.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Minn., N. D., S. D.	
12.	St. Louis, Mo.	Mo., Kan., Okla., Ia.	Kansas City, Des Moines
13.	Denver, Colo.	Colo., Wyo., Neb., Utah	Salt Lake City
14.	Helena, Mont.	Mont., Idaho	Moscow, Idaho
15.	Seattle, Wash.	Washington	
16.	Portland, Ore.	Oregon	
17.	San Francisco, Cal.	Nor. Cal., Nevada	Fresno, Sacramento
18.	Los Angeles, Cal.	Southern Cal., Ariz.	San Diego, Tucson

* Table supplied by Department of Labor.

The foregoing zones for the purpose of facilitating the distribution of farm labor in the United States are hereby established.

Approved:

(Signed) W. B. WILSON,
Secretary.

(Signed) A. CAMINETTI,
Commissioner General.

STATUTORY REGULATIONS

Dates of Laws

Of the nineteen states which have passed laws providing for free employment agencies several have passed more than one law on the subject. In such cases the provisions of the most recent act are given.

The bureau first created under state law is that of Ohio, established 1890. Laws creating state bureaus began in earnest with the twentieth century, although two more, Missouri and Illinois, were established in 1899. Most of these older laws have since been materially modified or replaced entirely. Between 1900 and 1905 Connecticut, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, West Virginia, Kansas and Wisconsin passed laws providing for free labor exchanges. Massachusetts followed in 1906; Colorado and Nebraska in 1907; Oklahoma and Rhode Island in 1908; Indiana in 1909; and by 1914 Kentucky, South Dakota and New York had provided for "state employment bureaus."

General Supervision and Local Offices

There are two favorite ways of providing for the location of local employment offices. The first is to name a minimum population standard; the second is to leave the selection to the discretion of those in charge of the bureau. The first method is followed by Colorado, Illinois, Indiana and Missouri; the second by Wisconsin, West Virginia, Rhode Island, Massachusetts and New York. In Connecticut, Michigan, Minnesota and Maryland the legislators themselves selected the locations for the local offices, and provided accordingly in the laws. Ohio is divided into five districts, with a local office in each district. Oklahoma has a central office at the capitol, and two branch offices. Kansas provides for local offices in cities of the "first and second class." Nebraska, Maryland and Kentucky provide for a central office only, the business to be transacted by mail. Where population is made the basis for the location of local offices, the minimum requirement ranges from 25,000 in Colorado to 75,000 in Missouri. Colorado allows two offices in a city of 200,000, while Illinois provides for three in a city of 1,000,000 population. The California bill provides for offices "in the cities of San Francisco, Los Angeles and Sacramento, and thereafter, whenever he [commissioner of labor statistics] deems it necessary, in other cities and towns."⁴

In a great number of cases the general supervision of the employment bureau is given to the commissioner, deputy commissioner, or chief, as the case might be, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Such is the case in Colorado, Connecticut, Indiana, Maryland,

⁴ Senate Bill No. 325, Section 2. Introduced January 18, 1915.

Massachusetts, Missouri, Rhode Island and in the proposed law in California. The Massachusetts commissioner has requested in consecutive annual reports to have the Massachusetts bureau transferred from his department. The commissioner of labor directs bureau affairs in West Virginia, Oklahoma, Ohio, Nebraska, Minnesota, Michigan and Illinois. Kansas and New York, and Pennsylvania in its proposed act, provide for a Director of Free Employment, and Wisconsin, under its 1911 law, gives full supervisory powers to the Industrial Commission created by the act.

Most states supply a superintendent and an assistant for the local office. In some cases this force is supplemented by a clerk, interpreter and special agents. Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Oklahoma and New York have provided for some combination of these officers. Kansas thrusts the duties of the local office on the city clerk, unless the local council provides otherwise. No extra compensation is allowed the city clerk, but a "penalty" provides that he shall be relieved of this work unless it is properly performed; "Provided, Such removal shall not affect the tenure of his office as to its other duties."⁵ Maryland and Nebraska provide for a central office only, with such clerical assistance as may be deemed necessary. The Illinois statute states that "The assistant superintendent or clerk shall in each case be a woman."⁶ The statutes of Michigan, Rhode Island, West Virginia and Wisconsin leave these details to the discretion of those in charge.

Colorado, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri and Oklahoma fix the superintendent's salary at \$1,200 per annum. Where an assistant is provided the remuneration ranges from \$600 in Oklahoma, to \$1,000 in Colorado. Illinois provides \$1,500 for the superintendent, \$1,200 for the assistant and \$1,000 for the clerk. New York has no statutory provisions regulating salaries, but in practice has allowed its superintendents \$2,000, with graded salaries for subordinate officers. The other states leave this matter to the discretion of the supervisory powers.

⁵ *General Statutes of Kansas, 1909.* Chapter 185, Section 12. Law of March 29, 1901.

⁶ *Revised Statutes of Illinois for 1913.*

Senate Bill No. 165, Section 2. Approved June 21, 1913.

Appointment and Tenure of Office

In all cases where the law enumerates provisions on the subject of appointment, the recommending power, at least, is given to the person having general supervision. In the majority of cases this same supervisory power has the privilege of appointment. In Illinois, the "Governor, with the advice and consent of the Senate," has the actual appointing power.⁷ The New York law provides for civil service appointments. The "director," with a \$4,000 salary, is specifically included in this rule, the law stating that, "As a part of such examination each candidate shall be required to submit a detailed plan of organization and administration of employment offices such as are contemplated by this article."⁸ The proposed Pennsylvania law leaves all appointments to the commissioner of labor, but enumerates the qualifications which the "director" should possess. Kansas, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, and California, in its present bill, give no instruction on this subject.

Colorado, Illinois and Ohio provide that their local officers shall serve for a period of two years, "unless sooner removed for cause." The superintendent has charge of engaging and dismissing his subordinates in Ohio. In Oklahoma the local officers serve during the term of the commissioner who appointed them. Nebraska, Minnesota, Maryland and Kansas, making no provision for method of appointment, likewise make none for tenure of office. The other states, with the exception of New York where civil service regulations are required, leave the tenure of service of local officers to those in charge. Three of these states have, in practice, adopted civil service regulations.

Advisory Committee

A recent development in the management of the local offices is the advisory committee. Such committees are provided for in the New York law, are specified by the Wisconsin Industrial Commission, and are included in the proposed law for Pennsylvania. This committee, as its name signifies, acts in an advisory capacity

⁷ *Revised Statutes of Illinois for 1913. Senate Bill No. 165, Section 2. Approved June 21, 1913.*

⁸ *New York Labor Laws of 1914. Chapter 181, Article 5-A, Section 66.*

to the local superintendent. Employers and employees are represented on the committee, which generally elects its own chairman. The New York law requires:⁹

At the request of a majority either of the employers or of the employees on advisory committees, the voting on any particular question shall be so conducted that there shall be an equality of voting power between the employers and the employees, notwithstanding the absence of any member.

Charge for Service and other Administrative Provisions

With two exceptions the various laws stipulate that there shall be no charge to employer or employee for the service rendered by the state bureau. The Wisconsin law leaves the question to the Commission. The 1909 law in Indiana provided that "No fee or compensation shall be charged . . . except it shall be lawful for applicants to enclose sufficient postage for all replies."¹⁰ This provision was scarcely ever complied with in practice and was repealed in the law of March 6, 1911. Nine states name penalties for accepting fees. The most common penalty is "not less than twenty-five (\$25) dollars nor more than fifty (\$50) dollars, or imprisonment in the county jail not more than thirty days, or by both such fine and imprisonment at the discretion of the court."¹¹

Four western states, and Rhode Island and New York in the east, stipulate advertising as a legitimate expense. New York provides that this item shall not exceed 5 per cent of the total appropriation. The New York and Massachusetts bureaus are allowed to carry on outside work of a social nature. Massachusetts and Michigan have a fund for general expenses. Colorado and Illinois provide for interpreters when advisable. Several states declare that stationery and printed matter shall be furnished by the secretary of the state.

In cases where the number and nature of the reports of local offices are not left to the direction of the commissioner, the laws generally provide for weekly and annual reports, the annual report to contain a detailed expense account as well as more or less statistical data. Ohio requires a semi-annual report in addition to the

⁹ *New York Labor Laws of 1914.* Chapter 181, Article 5-A, Section 66-f.

¹⁰ *Laws of Indiana.* Chapter 155, Section 3. Approved March 8, 1909.

¹¹ *General Statutes of Colorado.* Chapter 129, Section 7. Approved April 5, 1907.

weekly report. All states require fairly complete records of office work. The nature and amount of statistical information is generally left to the commissioner. When complete social statistics are provided for it is generally stipulated that they shall not be obligatory on the applicant, nor shall such files be open to the general public. When this information is published it shall be presented in such a way as to disguise its source.¹² A favorite statistical requirement is "the cause and duration of non-employment."¹³

The order in which positions shall be filled is mentioned in only a few cases. The Kansas law states that applicants shall be notified of positions in the order of their application. Massachusetts gives preference to "residents of the commonwealth."¹⁴ Rhode Island restricts privilege of registration to residents of the state.¹⁵

Several state laws go into detail as to the management of the local offices. Colorado, Illinois, and Indiana provide that separate rooms shall be given over to the sexes. Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska and Rhode Island limit the life of an application to thirty days. Several laws require references, but none provides for the use of these references by the bureau. The West Virginia bureau, under the present management, is making a practice of following up references. In those states where an effort is made to place ex-convicts, the past of the applicant is made plain to the employer. Six laws require local offices to coöperate with large employers of labor.

Strike Policy

The great majority of states make no provision as to a strike policy in their laws. The New York law provides that all positions shall be listed with information in cases where strikes exist.¹⁶ The policy of the different states is noted on Table II. The California bill contains no statement in this connection. The

¹² *General Statutes of Indiana, 1911.* Chapter 274, Section 3. Approved March 6, 1911.

¹³ *General Statutes of Colorado, 1907.* Chapter 129, Section 3. Approved April 5, 1907.

¹⁴ *Laws of Massachusetts. Acts of 1909.* Chapter 514, Section 5. Approved June 18, 1909.

¹⁵ *General Laws of Rhode Island, 1909.* Chapter 81, Section 4.

¹⁶ For the wording of this provision see *New York Labor Laws for 1914*, Chapter 181, Article 5-A, Section 66-g.

strike policy occasioned much controversy in the drafting of the Pennsylvania bill. It appears similar to the New York provision.¹⁷

Regulation and Supervision of Private Agencies

California, Connecticut, Illinois and Missouri provide for the regulation of private employment agencies in the same law establishing the state employment bureaus. In all of these cases it may be seen from the comparative amount of space given to the state and private agencies that it was the purpose rather to curb the private agency than to establish an efficient state agency. Most of the other states regulate private agencies through a separate law. Provisions for a system of inspection and reports have proved effective in several instances.

Appropriations

Several state laws provide for the first appropriation for the employment bureau. A few mention subsequent appropriations. Kansas provides \$1,000 and West Virginia \$500. Results in these states are commensurate with the appropriations. Indiana allows \$4,500 for total expenses. Some states leave the appropriation to the general court. The Michigan bureau draws its allowance from the \$40,000 appropriation to the Department of Labor. The first annual appropriation for the New York bureau was \$62,631.66. The proposed California act asks for \$50,000 for the first year.

ACHIEVEMENTS

Some of those who are engaged in the actual work of managing employment bureaus contend that much of the success of the undertaking depends on the powers and control of the bureau. J. T. Fitzpatrick, Commissioner of Labor Statistics of Missouri, strongly urges that the bureau be under the control of one man with broad powers and be independent of all other state departments. A less restricted policy would enable the bureau to undertake several lines of outside work, whose ultimate aim is the prevention of un-

¹⁷ Definitions.—Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Nebraska, Oklahoma and Rhode Island have considered it necessary to define various terms used in their respective acts. The usual terms defined are "applicant for employment," "applicant for help," "person," "employment agency," and "private employment agency."

TABLE II
STATUTORY LIMITATIONS OF

State	General supervision	Personnel local bureau	Bureaus in cities of	Local superintendents	
				Appointment	Tenure
Col.	Deputy comm. bu. of statistics	Supt. Asst. supt.	Over 25,000 Two for 200,000	Commissioner recom. by deputy	2 yrs. Remove "for cause"
Conn.	Commissioner bu. of statistics	Supt.	5 Cities named	Commissioner	Pleasure of commissioner
Ill.	Labor commissioner	Supt. Asst. supt. Clerk	50,000 3 for 1,000,000	Gov. and senate Recom. by board	2 yrs. Remove "for cause"
Ind.	Chief bu. statistics	Supt. Clerk	50,000	Chief of bu. statistics	Pleasure of chief
Kan.	Labor commissioner	Clerk	1st Class 2nd Class	Labor commissioner	Pleasure of commissioner
Ky.	Labor commissioner	Clerk	Capital	Labor commissioner	Pleasure of commissioner
Md.	Chief bu. of statistics	No provision	Baltimore	No provision	No provision
Mass.	Director bu. of statistics	Supt. Asst. Clerks	Selected by director	Director	Pleasure of director
Mich.	Labor commissioner	Direction commissioner	Names 10 cities	Commissioner	Pleasure of commissioner
Minn.	Labor commissioner	Manager	Names 4 cities	Labor commissioner	Pleasure of commissioner
Mo.	Comm. labor statistics	Supt. Clerk	75,000	Commissioner	Pleasure of commissioner
Neb.	Labor commissioner	Clerk	Capital	Commissioner	Pleasure of commissioner
N. Y.	Director emp. bureaus	Supt. necessary assistants	Option commissioner	Civil service	No provision
Ohio	Indus. comm.	Supt. Clerk	5 Districts 1 each dis.	Governor Recom. by com-missioner	2 yrs. Remove "for cause"
Okla.	Labor commissioner	Supt.	Capital 2 Branches	Commissioner	Same as comm. Remove "for cause"
R. I.	Commissioner indus. statis.	Option commissioner	Option commissioner	Commissioner	Pleasure of commissioner
S. D.	Secretary Agriculture	Registrar of deeds	County seats	County Registrar of deeds	County Registrar of deeds
W. Va.	Labor commissioner	Option commissioner	Capital	Commissioner	Pleasure of commissioner
Wis.	Industrial commission	Option commission	Option commission	Commission	Pleasure of commission

TABLE II—*Continued*

STATE FREE EMPLOYMENT BUREAUS

General expense	Social statistics	S. S. records public	Interpreter	Office records	¹ Policy in case of strike	Preference in positions
Advertise; printing, etc.; sec. of state	Option commissioner	No	Yes	Complete	¹ No strike breakers	No provision
No provision	No provision	No	No provision	Complete	¹ No strike breakers	No provision
Advertise; printing, etc.; sec. of state	Yes	No	Yes	Complete	¹ No strike breakers	No provision
Advertising	Yes	No	No provision	Complete	No provision	No provision
\$500.00	Yes	No provision	No provision	Yes	¹ "Neutral"	Order of application
					¹ "Neutral"	No provision
Advertise	No provision	No provision	No provision	No provision	No provision	No provision
By general court	As required	Yes	No provision	Complete	¹ Applicant informed	Residents of commonwealth
Advertise; printing, etc. by state	Option commissioner	No provision	No provision	Complete	¹ No strike breakers	No provision
No provision	Yes	No provision	No provision	Complete	¹ Applicant informed	No provision
No provision	Yes	No provision	No provision	Complete	¹ No strike breakers	No provision
No provision	No provision	No provision	No provision	Names, address, work	No provision	No provision
Advertise	Option commissioner	No provision	No provision	Complete	Applicant informed	No provision
No provision	Option commission	No provision	No provision	Complete	¹ No strike breakers	No provision
Advertise	Yes	No	No provision	Complete	¹ No strike breakers	Fitness
Advertise	Option commissioner	No provision	No provision	Complete	¹ Applicant informed	Residents of state, only
Shared by co'ty and state	Yes	Yes	No provision	Complete	No provision	Fitness
No provision	No provision	No provision	No provision	No provision	¹ "Neutral"	No provision
No provision	Option commission	Option comm.	Option comm.	Option comm.	Option commission	Option commission

¹ From "Unemployment," *American Legislative Review*, May 1914, p. 365. Not a statutory provision.

employment, such as vocational guidance for immigrants and juveniles. This is the case in Massachusetts, New York, Wisconsin and other states where the average cost to the state of each position filled seems relatively high.¹⁸

It would seem that in spite of the provisions of the law the results of the local offices are, after all, dependent to a large extent on the qualifications of the superintendent. The superintendent should understand the technical principles involved in his business, the industrial problems of his state and nation, and he should be a capable manager. "He should be depended upon to train the staff, supervise the work and to develop an administrative machine that will be permanent."¹⁹ Can such a man be had for \$1,000 or \$1,200? Certainly not. The result is that the local superintendents are largely unfit political appointments. As a successful western private agency writes—"With a free office, the manager, as far as I have seen, knows nothing about an employment office. He draws his \$1,200 a year. If any jobs come, all right; if any help come, all right; he does not advertise for help or jobs."²⁰ The letters received from these local superintendents reveal both the ignorance and incapacity of all too many of them.

The lesson taught is simple. First the salary must be made large enough to attract efficient men, who should be appointed as the result of an examination and advanced in accordance with the results they produce. The experience of Wisconsin since 1911, under such a system, is sufficient recommendation. New York adopted a similar plan in 1914 at the establishment of its bureaus.

The advisory committee has had a limited but successful experience. It tends to minimize public suspicion and odium that sometimes attach to state labor exchanges. The representation of labor at the councils inspires confidence and secures a certain amount of public coöperation. The suspicion which often exists

¹⁸ "We consider that we are fortunate in having no restrictions on our method of managing these offices, and as the Commissioner has the power to issue orders having the force of law, we can handle the work much more expeditiously than if we were hampered by statutory provisions." Extract from a letter from M. D. Hammond, Vice-Chairman of the Industrial Commission of Ohio, dated December 14, 1914.

¹⁹ *American Labor Legislation Review*, Vol. IV, No. 2, publication 25, page 323.

²⁰ Kenworthy Employment Company, Wichita, Kansas. November, 21, 1914.

in connection with employment bureaus is well illustrated in a letter to the writer from the Secretary of the Muskegon Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Conger writes:

The Manufacturers' division of this association formerly conducted an employment bureau, but it was discontinued because of a growing sentiment among the employees themselves that the division maintained a sort of black list. The charge was absolutely unfounded, but the labor men were firm believers in the theory that if the manufacturers did not maintain a black list there was no reason for running the bureau.

Violent opposition almost paralyzed the Massachusetts employment bureau during the first year of its operation. A broad-gauged superintendent, backed by a representative advisory committee, has a good chance to gain public sympathy.

State aid to municipalities, under certain conditions, has improved the system of labor exchanges in several states. Under such a plan the state probably furnishes the local superintendent, while the city furnishes the offices and clerical help. By such a scheme cities which could do nothing independently join the system to the advantage of themselves and the other members of the system. The heading on the stationery of the Cleveland, Ohio, office, "State-City Free Labor Exchange," immediately suggests such a scheme.

There are a number of items entering into the office efficiency of the labor exchange. The labor statistician of Colorado, Richard E. Croskey, very emphatically maintains that efficiency "cannot be obtained running on an eight-hour basis." He advocates a 6 a. m. to 6 p. m. day and outside solicitors. Stationery from the Springfield and Worcester, Massachusetts, offices announces in a frame at the top that the office hours are from 8 a. m. to 5 p. m. The Boston office, in the same manner, declares 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. to be its hours. Complete records are necessary for efficient work in the local office. Records point out the problems. Incomplete records often make glowing reports. Separate entrances for men and women, as well as one for younger workers, increase the business of the bureau. A further separation of immigrants, clerks, etc., facilitates the usefulness of the work.

Advertising is an important function of the successful bureau. Too often this item is unprovided for. Many schemes have been developed to keep the purposes of the bureau continually before

the public. In a newspaper report, the commissioner of Missouri calls attention to a novel plan adopted by his department. "Every letter-head . . . and all printed matter, with available space extensive enough to be used for that purpose, will carry a display 'ad,' dealing with the scope of the state free employment bureau and emphasizing that the service is absolutely free."²¹ The superintendent of the Denver, Colorado, office reports to his chief that the efficiency of his office could be increased 50 per cent if a reasonable amount were allowed for advertising.²²

During the month of November, 1914, the employment office at Dayton, Ohio, had solicitors visit 109 employers. Coöperation with the employers, secured largely by such means, is an important factor in the growth of the Minnesota offices.²³ These offices placed over 55,000 persons during the year ending June 30, 1914, at an average cost of 17.7 cents. Another item seldom provided for in the laws or policy of state employment offices is the privilege to advance transportation. W. C. Daily, superintendent of the office at Colorado Springs, Colorado, says: "One of the greatest handicaps to a free office is the lack of transportation which the fee office often provides."²⁴ Provisions for an interpreter, messenger service, subscriptions to newspapers and trade journals, and funds for telephone and telegraph messages, aid in establishing the records for the successful offices. Milwaukee has an interpreter constantly at hand, thereby inviting the confidence of the foreign-born laborers.²⁵

The greatest advantage that the state bureau has over the private agency is its possibility for centralization and consequent coöperation. If this feature is neglected there is little justification for the state bureau as a constructive agency. "The eight free employment offices now existing [in Illinois] are doing a great deal, 'tis true, but lacking as we do, a uniform and coördinate system . . . we find ourselves handicapped and discouraged in the successful conduct of our free employment agencies."²⁶ Coöpera-

²¹ Labor Commissioner John T. Fitzpatrick in the *Democrat* of Jefferson City, Missouri, January 2, 1915.

²² Report of Eli M. Gross to the Commissioner of Labor, December 20, 1912.

²³ *United States Labor Bulletin No. 109*. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1913, page 93.

²⁴ Extract from a letter to the writer, dated December 4, 1914.

²⁵ Report of Wisconsin Industrial Agency for 1914, page 41.

²⁶ Extract from a letter from Luke D. McCoy, Secretary for Commission of Labor, Springfield, Illinois, December 14, 1914.

tion of county clerks and supervisors produced especially good results for farm labor in Michigan during the past year. The tendency towards national coöperation of state employment bureaus is evidenced in the organization known as the American Association for Free Employment Bureaus. Coöperation with several of the departments of the federal government, such as the bureaus of building, irrigation, and harbor improvement, would also aid in a thoroughly organized distribution of labor. President Wilson, in speaking of federal agencies in his Indianapolis speech of January 9, 1915, said: "If I were writing an additional plank for a Democratic platform I would put that in."

From many sources comes the plea for specialization in the state agencies. It is pointed out how effectiveness is secured among Chicago's three hundred private agencies by a division of the field as regards kinds of positions. Each of the three state offices in Chicago covers the whole field with a comparatively small force, and is consequently a poor competitor of the private agencies. Specialization is intensively developed at the Boston office by Superintendent W. L. Sears. The central bureau in Kansas is unable to operate an extensive system due to the meagerness of its appropriation and has therefore confined itself principally to placing harvest hands during that season. W. L. O'Brien, Commissioner of Labor for Kansas, estimates that his bureau placed 60,000 men during the harvest season just passed. The allowance for this work was \$1,000. Missouri offices placed 16,436 men in the harvest fields of that state during June, July and August, 1914.

Special work undertaken by many of the state offices includes settlement of claims for employees, prosecutions under the law, vocational guidance, juvenile work in schools, finishing schools, advising immigrants, securing harvesters in western states, and the inspection and prosecution of private agencies. During the year 1911-1912 the Colorado Springs office settled 1,546 claims, involving \$45,620.83, without any cost to the wage-earners. Vocational guidance for children and immigrants guards against exploitation, "blind-alley" occupations and unemployment.

An idea of some of the evils of unscrupulous private agencies is given in the 1914 report of the Department of Labor and Industries of Minnesota.²⁷ The number of complaints and the cause of complaint is shown in the following table from the report:

²⁷ *Fourteenth Biennial Report, 1913-1914*, part 7, page 170.

Failure to secure employment.....	54
Misrepresentation by agency.....	20
Misrepresentation by employer.....	15
Unwarranted deductions from wages.....	9
Failure of employer to fulfill contract.....	11
Soliciting help without a license.....	6
Attempting to collect additional fee.....	2
Withholding baggage.....	1
Extortion.....	1
Fee splitting.....	1
Sending to positions without an order.....	1
Total.....	121

In reporting to the United States Department of Labor as to the charges made for registering applicants, securing positions and securing help, a private agency of Baltimore answered, in each case: "All I can get." Collusion between the agent of the large employer of labor and the private agent, induced by a splitting of fees, leads to many disgusting practices. D. M. Lyman, superintendent of the municipal office at Seattle, Washington, states that private agencies have become so interlocked with contractors and large employers of labor, that it is almost impossible for a laborer to get work in some western states without paying for it.²⁸

Illinois provides a \$3,600 inspector with several \$1,500 assistants for regulating private agencies. During 1913 this state prosecuted 50 cases, securing 48 convictions. All private agencies, however, are not of this type. During 1911 the Illinois bureau received complaints from 92 private agencies, while 217 were free from complaint. This is, of course, not conclusive proof that no evil practices existed in the 217 cases. The director of the bureau should have, as he has in some cases, the power to suspend and revoke licenses of private agencies on his own authority, after a public hearing.

The policies that have developed in the various states in regard to supplying strike-breakers are presented in Table II. The best policy seems to be that outlined in the tentative proposals of the United States Commission on Industrial Relations,²⁹ as on pages 182-183.

²⁸ In a letter of December 14, 1914.

²⁹ Washington, D. C., May 5, 1914, page 12, section 36.

Any association of employers or workmen may file at a public employment office a statement with regard to the existence of a strike or lockout affecting their trade. If any employer who appears to be affected by a statement so filed applies for workers at an employment office maintained by the bureau, the superintendent shall inform him of the statement that has been filed and give him an opportunity of making a written statement thereon. No superintendent shall refer any applicants for employment to such an employer without informing them of the statements that have been received.

Cost figures per position secured are often misleading. The total cost of the office depends largely upon the amount of social work performed, for which no direct result is apparent. Some offices, because of the nature of the industries among which they are placed, supply a great amount of short time work. The Industrial Commission of Wisconsin reports that of the 25,205 positions secured during the years 1913 and 1914, 8,556 were short jobs.³⁰

The causes for the failures among the state bureaus are easily discovered. In the first instance it is due to the appropriation. A small appropriation is worse than none; it accomplishes no results and is an inducement to corruption. Kansas, with its \$1,000 makes an effort to attract men to harvest its crops during three months of the year. The West Virginia bureau, backed by a \$500 appropriation, is inactive. In Nebraska, where the Governor serves as Commissioner of Labor, the bureau is inactive. No appropriation is provided for in the law. South Dakota has a law, passed 1913, but no appropriation has been provided and the bureau is inactive. Maryland, starting out in a half-hearted way with one office at Baltimore, dwindled until, in reply to an inquiry, the Bureau of Statistics and Information writes, under date of December 31, 1914: "I would say that the law authorizing this bureau to maintain an employment exchange has never been more than a mere statute." The appropriation is the first essential. Proper funds, managed correctly, will attract a capable personnel, which is the second *sine qua non*. The municipal offices, operating independently, are naturally limited in resources and achievements. The Newark, New Jersey, office is in charge of the city clerk and operates mostly by "want ads" and circular letters. The municipal office at Seattle, Washington, is noteworthy in its phenomenally low cost per position

³⁰ Biennial Report of June 30, 1914, page 42.

TABLE III
ACHIEVEMENTS OF STATE EMPLOYMENT BUREAUS

State	State appropria-tion	Expense account	Directr. salary	Supt. salary	Offices	Advertis-ing
Col.	\$9,800.00	\$9,800.00	Charge of deputy com-missioner	\$1,200.00	4	\$20.00
¹ Conn.	\$9,000.00	\$8,765.12	Charge of comm. labor	\$1,200.00	5	\$100.00
¹ Ill.	\$44,145.00	\$43,118.90	Charge of director labor states.	\$1,500.00	8	No acct.
Ind.	\$9,000.00	\$8,669.30	Chief Bu. Statistics	\$1,200.00	5	No acct.
Kan.	\$1,000.00	No separate acct.	Charge of comm. labor	\$1,000.00	1	Nothing
⁶ Ky.	\$1,800.00				1	No acct.
³ Md.						
Mass.	\$36,350.00	\$33,901.68	Charge of director statistics	\$1,200.00 to \$1,800.00	4	\$627.17
Mich.	General for dept. labor	Approx. \$9,000.00	Charge of comm. labor	\$1,000.00	5	Nothing
² Minn.	\$10,000.00	\$9,799.58	Charge of comm. labor	\$1,100.00	3	Nothing
Mo.	General for dept. labor	No separate acct.	Charge of comm. labor	\$1,200.00	3	\$100.00
Neb.	General for dept. labor	No separate acct.	Charge of comm. labor		1	No acct.
N. Y.	\$62,631.66	\$62,631.66	\$4,000.00	\$2,000.00 (graded)	5	5% ex-penditure
Ohio	General for indus. comm.	Approx. \$20,000.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00 to \$1,800.00	5	\$25.00
⁷ Okla.	\$4,100.00		\$1,200.00	\$600.00	3	No acct.
⁶ R. I.	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	Charge of comm. labor		1	No acct.
⁵ W. Va.	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	Charge of comm. labor	\$1,200.00	1	No acct.
² Wis.	General for indus. Comm.	\$8,888.16	Charge of indus. comm.		4	

¹ Year ending Sept. 30, 1914.

² Year ending June 30, 1914.

³ Operations under the law abandoned entirely in 1914.

⁴ Operation too recent for figures of value.

TABLE III—*Continued*

FOR THE YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1914

Amount transportation	Special work	Applicants	Successful	Cost per pos.	% males	Private agencies	Regulated
None	None	2 yrs. 68,346	2 yrs. 46,081	42½¢	72	42	Yes
None	None	14,483	7,284	\$1.20	49	54	Yes
None	Vocational guidance, etc.	102,285	66,613	65¢	68	325	Yes
None	Coöperate with county agents	approx. 40,000	30,195	50¢	78	17	Yes
None	Harvest workers	1,140	716	No rec.	90	19	Yes
None	Coöperate with country banks	2,193	1,120	\$1.63		No rec.	Yes
None	Vocational G., placing handicapped.	No record	24,710	\$1.38	54		Yes
None	None	No record	15,366	58¢	66	25	Yes
None	None	No record	55,135	17.7¢	50	100	Yes
None	Assist. destitute; stand. brd. house etc.	No record	27,590	No rec.	90	67	Yes
No acct.	None	No record	No record	No rec.		No rec.	Yes
None	Juvenile labor vocational guidance school registration etc	4	4	4	58		Yes
None	Immigration. voca. guid. place handic.	7 mos. 192,379	7 mos. 33,170	est. 38¢	68	45	Yes
None	None	23,159	13,294	37¢		approx. 40	Yes
None	Voca. guid. by manager	3,029	2,386	\$1.67	49	"Very few"	Yes
None	None	2,205	1,936	61¢	74		No
	Immigration voca. guid. etc.	51,997	25,205	35¢	78	39	Yes

⁵ For the year 1912. Commissioner gave no figures in 1914 report.⁶ For the year 1913.⁷ For the years 1909-1910.⁸ For the years 1912-1914.

filled. Since 1908 it has not reached 6 cents, touching the low limit of 4.18 cents in 1909. During that year 38,846 workers were placed.

The national bureau has not collected any figures from which to judge of its effectiveness. The chief of the division in this department writes, March 13, 1915: "Since the work is in the formative stage and much of the work experimental as to detail, statistics bearing on the same would fall short of being illuminating or of practical value just now."

There is a general expression from all sections of the country that the recent business depression has had a decided effect on the results of state employment bureaus during 1914. In many cases the previous steady growth in business has been decidedly retarded.

The history of the public employment bureau in this country has not been a particularly bright one. Nor has it been a long one. We have hardly had sufficient experience in this new line to develop a marked efficiency. We are just beginning to have men who are trained in the work. Then, too, the immediate cause of the bureaus in many states, political rewards did not prophesy a particularly efficient future. The financial backing has been, in almost all cases, insufficient for a useful and growing bureau.

A national system of centralized and coöperating exchanges, towards which we are rapidly working, will form a very efficient machine for keeping our reserve labor supply at its minimum. But the bureaus are merely distributive agents. They gather the information and point out the opportunities. They do not create jobs. They are the first step in the solution of the problem of unemployment, a problem which is rapidly becoming a national question. The facilities afforded by a comprehensive system of exchanges, and the data which they would collect in a few years, would form the basis for the information and regulations looking toward regularization of industries, shifting of help among the seasonable occupations, and the correct treatment of the unemployables—the real solution of the problem.